



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,065	01/16/2002	Pete Rowley	AOL0023	3384
22862	7590	06/03/2005	EXAMINER	
GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L MENLO PARK, CA 94025			ORTIZ, BELIX M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/051,065

Applicant(s)

ROWLEY, PETE

Examiner

Belix M. Ortiz

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-26 and 29-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-18, 25, 26 and 29-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 19-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/5/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

DETAILED ACTION

**Remarks**

1. In response to communications files on 3-March-2005, claims 1, 10, 20-23, and 25 are amended per applicant's request and new claims 15 and 27-28 are cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-14, 16-26, and 29-34 are presently pending in the application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Huben et al. (U.S. patent 6,484,177).

As to claim 1, Van Huben et al. teaches in a directory server containing heterogeneous directory entries, a method of hierarchically navigating the entries (see column 2, lines 6-11; column 5, lines 33-35; and column 14, lines 13-21) comprising the steps of:

creating one or more directory views (see abstract and column 1, lines 8-9);  
organizing the directory views into a hierarchy using only information

concerning the entries (see column 2, lines 12-20; column 8, lines 45-51; column 12, lines 56-59; and column 15, lines 54-56); and

using one of the directory views that is most appropriate for navigating to the entries (see abstract and column 1, lines 8-17).

As to claim 2, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the entries do not need to be physically in any particular place (see column 7, lines 12-14; column 7, lines 40-59; and column 11, lines 37-38).

As to claim 3, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the directory server may have a flat directory information tree (see column 2, lines 23-26; column 7, lines 49-52; column 13, lines 63-65; and column 20, lines 31-35).

As to claim 4, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the existence of the directory views is transparent to a client of the directory server and the client is not required to have special knowledge of the directory views to use them (see column 11, lines 47-52 and column 12, lines 16-18).

As to claim 5, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein each of the directory views begins with an ordinary entry (see column 2, lines 12-17 and column 12, lines 56-59).

As to claim 6, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein each of the directory views belongs to a specific object class that contains a filter attribute, the filter attribute containing a filter that describes the views (see column 11, lines 23-30 and column 16, lines 20-29).

As to claim 7, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the filter attribute is omitted from the views to facilitate a hierarchical directory structure (see column 16, lines 30-31).

As to claim 8, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein each of the directory views comprises sub-views which provide a subset of the views (see column 2, lines 26-36).

As to claim 9, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the sub-views comprises different subject domains from the directory views (see column 9, lines 41-49).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 10-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Huben et al. (U.S. patent 6,484,177) in view of Harvey (U.S. publication 2002/0169767).

As to claim 10, Van Huben et al. teaches in a directory server containing directory entries and a directory views hierarchy, each view containing a filter describing the view, a method of searching the view in the directory views hierarchy with a given filter (see abstract; figure 2A; column 2, lines 41-43; column 8, lines 45-46; column 11, lines 23-30; and column 16, lines 20-29), comprising the steps of:

wherein each of the directory views belongs to a specific object class that contains a filter attribute, the filter attribute containing a filter that describes the directory views (see column 11, lines 23-30 and column 16, lines 20-29).

Van Huben et al. does not teach rewriting the given filter to be a sub-tree search of the parent of the top most view in the view hierarchy; and  
performing the sub-tree search with the rewritten filter.

Harvey teaches a table arrangement for a directory service system and for related method facilitating queries for the directory (see abstract) in which he teaches rewriting the given filter to be a sub-tree search of the parent of the top most view in the view hierarchy (see page 4, paragraphs 94 and 99); and

performing the sub-tree search with the rewritten filter (see page 4, paragraph 98).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Van Huben et al., to include rewriting the given filter to be a sub-tree search of the parent of the top most view in the view hierarchy; and

performing the sub-tree search with the rewritten filter.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Van Huben et al. by the teaching of Harvey, because rewriting the given filter to be a sub-tree search of the parent of the top most view in the view hierarchy; and performing the sub-tree search with the rewritten filter, would enable the directory server to perform the correct search to realize the view, because

“Still furthermore, for a search, filter and subtree searches can be provided by a single pass resolution and using the path column. One invention is to utilise a ‘path’ field to simultaneously apply an arbitrary filter over an arbitrary subtree. The complications of aliases is handled by applying the above method to a uniquely resolved subtree”, (see Harvey, page 4, paragraph 98).

“Yet another unique method is to store the “path” of each entry as a string. Each path will then be prefixed by the path of its parent entry. This is useful for the filter in the search service”, (see Harvey, page 4, paragraph 99).

As to claim 11, Van Huben et al. as modified, teaches wherein the entries do not need to be physically in any particular place (see Van Huben et al., column 7, lines 12-14; column 7, lines 40-59; and column 11, lines 37-38).

As to claim 12, Van Huben et al. as modified, teaches wherein the directory server has a flat directory information tree (see Van Huben et al., column 2, lines 23-26; column 7, lines 49-52; column 13, lines 63-65; and column 20, lines 31-35).

As to claim 13, Van Huben et al. as modified, teaches wherein the existence of the views is transparent to a client of the directory server and the client requires no special knowledge of the views to use them (see Van Huben et al., column 11, lines 47-52 and column 12, lines 16-18).

As to claim 14, Van Huben et al. as modified, teaches wherein each of the directory views begins with an ordinary entry (see Van Huben et al., column 2, lines 12-17 and column 12, lines 56-59).

As to claim 16, Van Huben et al. as modified, teaches wherein the filter attribute is omitted from the directory views to facilitate a hierarchical directory structure (see Van Huben et al., column 16, lines 30-31).

As to claim 17, Van Huben et al. as modified, teaches wherein each of the directory views comprises sub-views which provide a subset of the views (see Van Huben et al., column 2, lines 26-36).

As to claim 18, Van Huben et al. as modified, teaches wherein the sub-views comprises different subject domains from the directory views (see Van Huben et al., column 9, lines 41-49).

6. Claims 25-26 and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Huben et al. (U.S. patent 6,484,177) in view of Peters et al (U.S. patent 6,292,795).

As to claim 25, Van Huben et al. teaches A directory server for managing heterogeneous directory information (see column 2, lines 6-11; column 5, lines 33-35; and column 14, lines 13-21), comprising:

a plurality of directory entries (see column 2, lines 1-2; column 2, lines 12-15; and column 2, lines 29-36);

a flat directory information tree (see column 2, lines 23-26; column 7, lines 49-52; column 13, lines 63-65; and column 20, lines 31-35);

a set of directory views to facilitate hierarchical navigation of the directory entries (see abstract; column 1, lines 8-17; and column 14, lines 7-16).

Van Huben et al. does not teach means to search the directory views by rewriting filters.

Peter et al. teaches Indexed file system and a method and a mechanism for accessing data records from such a system (see abstract) in which he teaches means to search the directory views by rewriting filters (see column 14, lines 34-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to have modified Van Huben et al., to include means to search the directory views by rewriting filters.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Van Huben et al. by the teaching of Peters et al., because means to search the directory views by rewriting filters, would enable “Each data entry operation corresponding to registration of an individual and also each verification and search operation for an individual preferably includes the above described steps for data allocation or data access. The insertion and deletion of data items are handled in the same way as comparisons, except that the bin is altered and then written back for insertions and deletions”, (see Peters et al., column 14, lines 34-40).

As to claim 26, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the directory entries do not need to be physically in any particular place (see column 7, lines 12-14; column 7, lines 40-59; and column 11, lines 37-38).

As to claim 29, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the existence of the directory views is transparent to a client of the directory server and the client is not required to have special knowledge of the directory views to use them (see column 11, lines 47-52 and column 12, lines 16-18).

As to claim 30, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein each of the directory views begins with an ordinary entry (see column 2, lines 12-17 and column 12, lines 56-59).

As to claim 31, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein each of the directory views belongs to a specific object class that contains a filter attribute, the filter attribute containing a filter that describes the directory views (see column 11, lines 23-30 and column 16, lines 20-29).

As to claim 32, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the filter attribute is omitted from the views to facilitate a hierarchical directory structure (see column 16, lines 30-31).

As to claim 33, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein each of the directory views comprises sub-views that provide a subset of the directory views (see column 2, lines 26-36).

As to claim 34, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the sub-views comprise different subject domains from the directory views (see column 9, lines 41-49).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 19-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record, Van Huben et al. (U.S. patent 6,484,177), and Harvey (U.S. pub. No. 2002/0169767), do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

the rewriting step further comprising:

- (a) collecting filters from the view and all ancestor views of the view 5 to form a first sub-filter;
- (b) if the search is not a sub-tree search, collecting all filters from all descendent views to form a second sub-filter;
- (c) adding a third sub-filter to ensure all children of the view are included in the search for one level search or ensure all descendents of the view are included for a sub-tree search; and
- (d) combining the sub-filters from steps (a)-(c) and the given filter to produce the rewritten filter, as claimed in claim 19.

Claims 20-24 are objected to as being dependent from the objected to dependent claim 19.

*Response to Arguments*

8. Applicant's arguments filed 3-March-2005 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive:

In response to applicants' arguments that Van Huben et al. "organizing the directory views into a hierarchy using only information concerning the entries", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, because Van Huben et al. teaches "teaches a method wherein a common logical structure is used to store both the files residing in a file system as well as the directory entries comprising a directory service. This approach permits directory service entries across multiple domains to be managed in a centralized fashion. Also, since the directory service entries are objects, standardized operations such as replication, querying and storing additional information is possible", (see Van Huben et al., column 2, lines 12-20).

In response to applicants' arguments that Van Huben et al. "wherein each of the directory views belongs to a specific object class that contains a filter attribute, the filter attribute containing a filter that describes the views", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, because Van Huben et al. teaches "The Control Repository Access Layer consists of one or more "transactions" which perform simple or complex operations against the Control Repository (CR) itself. These can typically be categorized as adding information to the CR, modifying existing information in the CR, deleting information from

the CR, or extracting (and potentially filtering) information out of the CR”, (see Van Huban et al., column 11, lines 23-30).

“All LDAP entries are required to have an objectclass attribute to describe its contents. For example the industry objectclass (61) requires the objectclass, c, o, ou and sector attributes. The sector objectclass (62) requires the c, o, ou and cn attributes. The appliance objectclass (63) requires the c, o, ou, partno, pl, level, var, model, size, color, spec and filetype attributes”, (see Van Huban et al., column 16, lines 23-29).

### *Conclusion*

9. Applicant’s amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Art Unit: 2164

examiner should be directed to Belix M. Ortiz whose telephone number is 571-272-4081.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 571-272-4083. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

bmo

May 19, 2005

  
**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**